

Gov. Doc
Can
Ag

Canada. Agriculture, Dept. of
Marketing Service. Economic Division
Report 1952 (October)

ALBERTA FARM OPERATORS

and the

LEVEL OF LIVING CONCEPT

1952

CAI DA 21
-50A42

HELEN C. ABELL



Farm Population and Rural Life Section

Economics Division

Marketing Service

Canada Department of Agriculture

Ottawa, October, 1952

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
University of Toronto

ALBERTA FARM OPERATORS
and the
LEVEL OF LIVING CONCEPT
1952

Helen C. Abell

Associate Economist
Farm Population and Rural Life Section

Economics Division

Marketing Service

Canada Department of Agriculture

Report No. 2

Ottawa, October, 1952.

PREFACE

This is the second of a series of short reports dealing with various aspects of a study made in June and July 1952 of the factors involved in the choice of alternative farm enterprises in two mixed farming areas of Alberta, Canada.

The first report published on September 17, 1952, dealt with the method of conducting the field work phase of the study. It is entitled "A Methodological Note".

This second report deals with the "level of living" concept in terms of its meaning for farm operators and the level of living rating they gave for their own families, their communities, their own province of Alberta, and Canada as a whole. It also includes the results of an objective level of living rating as determined by the Edwards socio-economic status scale.

ALBERTA FARM OPERATORS AND THE "LEVEL OF LIVING" CONCEPT

BACKGROUND

In June and July, 1952, field work was conducted in Central Alberta on a study designed to determine some of the factors associated with the reasons for a farmer's choice of alternative farm enterprises in two mixed farming areas. A short report was published in September 1952 dealing with the method of conducting the study.^{1/}

As an integral part of this study data were collected dealing with the socio-economic status of 202 respondents, all of whom were active farm operators and formed a representative sample of 1,215 farm operators in two census sub-divisions. The status was determined through application of a scale for rating socio-economic levels in rural Western Canada.^{2/} The 27 items in this scale are listed in Appendix, page 18. Family level of living for each respondent as measured by the Edwards scale was indicated by a score out of a possible total of 27.

In view of the lack of consensus on the meaning of the concept of "level of living", it was considered advisable to investigate the respondent's own interpretation of this term, and then to ask respondents to rate their own family level of living on the basis of their definition of the concept.

This report deals with: (A) the level of living status ascribed to respondents by an objective socio-economic status scale, (b) farm operators' definition of the "level of living" concept, (c) the level of living status claimed by each respondent based on his interpretation of the concept "level of

^{1/} A Methodological Note Concerning the study of "Factors Involved in the Choice of Alternative Farm Enterprises in Two Mixed Farming Areas of Alberta, June-July, 1952. Farm Population and Rural Life Section, Economics Division, Canada Department of Agriculture, Ottawa, Canada, September 17, 1952.

^{2/} A Scale for Rating Socio-Economic Levels in Rural Western Canada. Florence M. Edwards. Economics Division, Canada Department of Agriculture, University of Alberta, August, 1946.

living", and (d) the interrelationship between (a), (b), and (c).

A. FARM OPERATORS' LEVEL OF LIVING STATUS AS DETERMINED OBJECTIVELY

Respondents were not told that a socio-economic status scale was being applied. The interviewer simply said "I should like to ask a few questions about your house and the facilities you have". He then proceeded with a tabulation of the presence or absence of the 27 scale items.

Of the 202 respondents, none received a score of zero, one, two, or 27. The range of scores was from three to 26, the median score was 18, the modal scores were 19 and 20 and the average score was 17.

The distribution of the 202 respondents by this objective level of living score is shown in Table 1, in which a score of zero to nine is termed Low, 10-18 Medium and 19-27 High.

Table 1.- Distribution of Alberta Farm Operators
by Edwards Level of Living Score, 1952

Level of living score	Farm operators	
	- number -	- per cent -
High (19-27)	92	45.5
Medium (10-18)	90	44.6
Low (0-9)	20	9.9
Total	202	100.0

This distribution would indicate that relatively few (9.9 per cent) of the farm operators' families had a low level of living as measured by an objective socio-economic status scale.

B. FARM OPERATORS' INTERPRETATION OF THE CONCEPT OF "LEVEL OF LIVING"

It was only after the Edwards scale was applied that the term "level of living" was used by the interviewer. He asked

the respondent to define this term by saying "People often talk about the 'level of living'. What does this mean to you?"

As might be expected, a few respondents (fifteen) were unable to verbalize their interpretation of this term. The majority, however, did respond.

After a content analysis was made it became evident that these responses could be categorized as being in purely materialistic terms, purely non-materialistic terms or a combination of these.

The four categories into which the farm operators' interpretation of the term "level of living" fell were as follows:

- (1) Answers framed in purely materialistic terms. These included answers such as: "It means the standard of living, your food, clothing and shelter"; "it means the price farmers have to pay for things they buy, as compared with the price they receive for their produce"; "it means the amount of your income"; "it means whatever a farmer inherits"; "it means modernizing farming with new equipment".
- (2) Answers framed primarily in materialistic terms (as noted in 1) but also including terms expressing non-materialistic values such as "it means a man's individual effort and initiative"; "it means cultural activities such as music and reading"; "it means having satisfying family and social contacts", "recreation, "peace of mind", "health", "spiritual values".
- (3) Answers framed primarily in non-materialistic terms (as detailed in (2)) but also including materialistic terms.
- (4) Answers framed in purely non-materialistic terms.

The distribution of the 202 respondents by their interpretation of the term "level of living" is shown in Table 2. It is noted that answers from approximately four-fifths of the farmers involved materialistic terms with or without any non-materialistic references. However 68 per cent (137) of the farmers answered in materialistic terms only or in materialistic terms primarily and non-materialistic secondarily, while 25 per cent (50) of the men answered in non-materialistic terms only or in non-materialistic terms primarily and in materialistic terms secondarily.

Table 2.- Distribution of Alberta Farm Operators in Relation to Their Interpretation of the Term "Level of Living", 1952

Interpretation	Farm operating	
	- number -	- per cent -
Purely materialistic terms	90	44.5
Materialistic terms primarily plus non-materialistic terms	47	23.3
Non-materialistic terms primarily plus materialistic terms	24	11.9
Purely non-materialistic terms	26	12.9
No interpretation given	15	7.4
Total	202	100.0

C. SUBJECTIVE LEVEL OF LIVING RATING IN TERMS OF RESPONDENTS' INTERPRETATION OF THE "LEVEL OF LIVING" CONCEPT

After obtaining the respondents' interpretation of the "level of living" concept the interviewers asked the following questions. "On the basis of your definition of the level of living, let us suppose that all people in Canada, on farms and in cities, are thought of as being in one of several level of living groups. Suppose that the first group is at the highest level, the second group at the next highest level and so on for five different levels.

At which level do you think most Canadians would be placed?

At which level do you think most people in Alberta would be placed?

At which level do you think most people in this community would be placed?

At which level do you think your family would be placed?"

Although 15 respondents had been unable to verbalize their interpretation of the concept (as noted in Table 1) a few of these men were quite willing to answer the questions concerning the level of living ratings.

It was found that while all but approximately six per cent (12) of the men were willing to give ratings for most

people in Alberta, in their community and their own families, approximately ten per cent (20) would not rate "most Canadians". The usual reason for this was stated as "I don't know enough about the rest of Canada to answer this".

Table 3, page 6 shows the level of living ratings that were given by respondents for the four progressively smaller population groupings.

It is interesting to note that while only approximately one-quarter of the respondents rated "most Canadians" at a high level of living, a much higher proportion of respondents rated their province, their communities and their families at this high level.

It is also noteworthy that the proportion of respondents giving low level of living ratings increased when communities and families were under consideration. These data suggested that an investigation of relative ratings might be in order. Accordingly the level of living ratings (High, Medium or Low) as given for each of the four population groupings were correlated with the ratings given for each of the other population groupings and the associations tested for significance using the Chi square test.

Respondents rating one population group at a higher level of living than the other population group may be categorized as "advantaged", respondents rating one population group at the same level of living as another population group may be categorized as "equal", and respondents rating one population group at a lower level of living than the other population group may be categorized as "disadvantaged".

The relative level of living ratings, as given by the farm operators for people in Canada, Alberta, their own community, and their own family is given in Table 4, page 8 and 9. This table indicates that feelings of equality in respect to level of living are most common when a farm operator compares his family with his community (expressed by 73 per cent of the respondents), and are least common when a farm operator compares his family with Canada as a whole (expressed by 43 per cent of the respondents).

The findings of this table further indicated that from 28 to 32 per cent of the respondents felt that the level of

living of their families, their communities and their province was at an advantage in relation to the level of living of Canada as a whole. About 11 per cent felt that the level of living of their families was at an advantage to the level of living in their province, and only about five per cent felt that their own level of living was at an advantage to the level of living in their own communities.

Table 3.- Level of Living Ratings as Given by Farm Operators for Four Population Groupings, Alberta, 1952

Level of living	: Level of living at which respondents would place:							
	: Most		: Most people		: in his own		: His own	
	: Canadians		: in Alberta		: community		: family	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
First	23	11.4	29	14.3	37	18.3	31	15.3
Second	29	14.3	68	33.7	53	26.2	49	24.3
Third	115	57.0	78	38.7	79	39.2	76	37.6
Fourth	13	6.4	14	6.9	19	9.4	26	12.9
Fifth	2	1.0	1	0.5	3	1.5	8	4.0
No rating	20	9.9	12	5.9	11	5.4	12	5.9
Total	202	100.0	202	100.0	202	100.0	202	100.0

Table 3a.- By Categorizing the First and Second Levels as High, The Third as Medium and the Fourth and Fifth Levels as Low, These Ratings May be Summarized as Follows:

High	52	25.7	97	48.0	90	44.5	80	39.6
Medium	115	57.0	78	38.7	79	39.2	76	37.6
Low	15	7.4	15	7.4	22	10.9	34	16.9
No rating	20	9.9	12	5.9	11	5.4	12	5.9
Total	202	100.0	202	100.0	202	100.0	202	100.0

On the other hand 16 to 24 per cent felt that their families' level of living was disadvantaged in relation to the level of living in their communities, in Alberta and in Canada; from 12-13 per cent felt that their communities' level of living was disadvantaged in relation to the level of living in Alberta and in Canada, and only about seven per cent felt that the level of

living in Alberta was at a disadvantage to the level of living in Canada as a whole.

For each of these paired population groupings in Table 4, page 8 a three way contingency table was set up, similar to the example given below between family level of living ratings as related to the rating for Canada as a whole.

Canada Rating

<u>Family Rating</u>	<u>Advantaged</u>	<u>Equal</u>	<u>Disadvantaged</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Level of living:</u>				
High	48	27	3	78
Medium	7	55	9	71
Low	1	5	26	32
Total	56	87	38	189

The null hypothesis was applied and was rejected for every one of these six pairs of population groupings. Chi square values ranging from 24.163 to 65.898 were obtained indicating a very significant association at the 99.9 per cent level for each pair of population groupings between a high level of living for one population group and feelings of being advantaged and/or equal, in relation to the other population group under consideration. Conversely a low level of living rating for one population grouping was positively associated with a feeling of being disadvantaged in relation to the other population grouping.

D. INTERRELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN (A) OBJECTIVE LEVEL OF LIVING STATUS, (B) RESPONDENTS' INTERPRETATION OF "LEVEL OF LIVING" CONCEPT AND (C) SUBJECTIVE LEVEL OF LIVING STATUS

1. Interrelationships Between (A) Objective Level of Living Status and (B) Respondents' Interpretation of "Level of Living Concept":

A correlation table (No. 5) was prepared to determine wheather any significant association existed between a respondent's level of living status as determined objectively by the Edwards socio-economic scale which measures level of living, and his own interpretation of the "level of living" concept.

The null hypothesis was made and on the basis of a Chi

Table 4.- Relative Level of Living Ratings, as Given by Farm Operators in Alberta
for People in Canada, Alberta, Own Community and Own Family 1952

Relative ratings	Level of living ratings as given by farm operators for					
	paired population groupings					
	Family and Community	Family and Alberta	Family and Canada			
	- number -	- per cent -	number -	- per cent-	number -	per cent
<u>Advantaged</u>	9	4.5	22	10.9	56	27.7
High vs. Med. or low	7		18		48	
Medium vs. low	1		4		7	
Low vs. lower	1		-		1	
<u>Equal</u>	148	73.3	118	58.4	87	43.1
High vs. high	71		59		27	
Medium vs. medium	60		51		55	
Low vs. low	17		8		5	
<u>Disadvantaged</u>	33	16.3	49	24.3	38	18.8
High vs. higher	2		3		3	
Medium vs. high	15		21		9	
Low vs. medium or high	16		25		26	
No comparable ratings	12	5.9	13	6.4	21	10.4
Total	202	100.0	202	100.0	202	100.0

- continued -

Table 4.- Relative Level of Living Ratings, as Given by Farm Operators in Alberta,
for People in Canada, Alberta, Own Community and Own Family 1952-
Continued

		: Level of living ratings as given by farm operators for									
		: paired population groupings									
Relative ratings		: Community and Alberta : Community and Canada : Alberta and Canada									
		: - number - - per cent - number - - per cent - number - per cent -									
		23	11.4	64	31.7	64	31.7	57	31.7		
<u>Advantaged</u>											
High vs. medium or low		18	54								
Medium vs. low		5	9					6			
Low vs. lower		-	1					1			
		139	68.8	92	45.5	103	51.0				
<u>Equal</u>											
High vs. high		71	32			37					
Medium vs. medium		59	55			60					
Low vs. lower		9	5			6					
		27	13.4	25	12.4	15	7.4				
<u>Disadvantaged</u>											
High vs. higher		1	2			-					
Medium vs. high		13	7			7					
Low vs. medium or high		13	16			8					
No comparable ratings		13	6.4	21	10.4	20	9.9				
Total		202	100.0	202	100.0	202	100.0				

square test ¹/of association it was accepted. Thus it may be stated that in this study the association between a respondent's level of living status (as determined by an objective scaling device) and his own interpretation of the "level of living" concept were not significantly associated.

Table 5.- Correlation between Objectively Determined Level of Living and Farm Operators' Interpretation of the Concept "Level of Living", Alberta, 1952

Interpretation of concept	Objectively determined level of living status:			
	High	Medium	Low	Total
Purely materialistic terms	38	41	11	90
Materialistic terms primarily plus non-materialistic terms	25	19	3	47
Non-materialistic terms primarily plus materialistic terms	12	9	3	24
Purely non-materialistic terms	14	10	2	26
No interpretation given	3	11	1	15
Total	92	90	20	202

This indicates that a respondent categorized as being at a high level of living was just as apt to interpret the "level of living" concept in materialistic terms as was a respondent categorized at a medium or low level of living.

Generalization.- On the basis of this finding the following generalization is suggested. An objectively ascribed high

¹/ A Chi square value of less than 0.5 was obtained.

level of living status (based chiefly on material possessions), is not necessarily associated only with these material possessions by a farm operator in his own conception of the term "level of living".

Implication.- This generalization implies a need for an awareness of differing value systems before assuming that all farm operators place an equal value on material possessions as determining their own family's level of living status.

2. Interrelationship Between (A) Objective and (C) Subjective Level of Living Status:

A correlation table (No. 6) was prepared to determine whether any significant association existed between a respondent's level of living status as determined objectively by the Edwards scale and his self-rating in terms of his definition of the "level of living" concept.

Table 6.- Correlation Between Objectively and Subjectively Determined Level of Living Status, Farm Operators, Alberta, 1952

Subjectively determined status	Objectively determined status:			
	High	Medium	Low	Total
High	45	31	4	80
Medium	36	30	10	76
Low	7	21	6	34
No rating given	4	8	-	12
Total	92	90	20	202

The null hypothesis was made and on the basis of a Chi square test of association it was rejected.^{1/} Thus it may be stated that in this study a very significant association existed

^{1/} A Chi square value (based on a contingency table with four degrees of freedom) of 15.451 was obtained. Chance alone would have given a value of only 13.277 at the 99 per cent level.

between a high level of living status as measured objectively and a high level of living status as determined subjectively by respondents.

This finding would seem to validate the Edwards scale as an instrument for measuring level of living status for farm operators in Alberta. However it should be pointed out that a noticeable proportion (31 out of 80) of farm operators rated as being at a medium status on the Edwards scale nevertheless rated themselves as at a high status. Correspondingly a noticeable proportion (36 out of 92) of farm operators objectively rated as being at a high status nevertheless rated themselves at a medium status. It is hypothesized that this distribution is due to the fact that subjective ratings were based on the farm operator's definition of level of living as being interpreted in materialistic or in non-materialistic terms.

Generalization.- The Edwards socio-economic status scale may be accepted as providing a method of objectively determining levels of living for the farm operators in two specific mixed farming areas of Alberta.

3. Interrelationship Between (B) Respondents' Interpretation of the "Level of Living" Concept and (C) Their subjectively-Determined Level of Living Status:

A correlation table (No. 7) was prepared to determine whether any significant association existed between a farm operator's interpretation of the "level of living" concept and his self-rating at a certain level of living based on this interpretation of the concept.

As a further refinement a four way contingency table (No. 8), page 13 was prepared, the null hypothesis tested by the Chi square method of determining association.

This contingency table yielded a Chi square value of 7.6465 which disproves the null hypothesis. Thus it may be stated that a very significant association existed between a farm operator's interpretation of the level of living concept and his self-determined level of living status.

Table 7.- Correlation Between Interpretation of the Concept "Level of Living" and Self-Determined Status Based on this Interpretation, Farm Operators, Alberta, 1952

Interpretations of concept	: Subjectively determined level of living status :				
	: High :	Medium :	Low :	No rating :	Total
	:	:	:	given :	
	:	:	:	:	
Purely materialistic terms	31	37	18	4	90
Materialistic terms primarily plus non-materialistic terms	17	21	8	1	47
Non-materialistic terms primarily plus materialistic terms	15	7	1	1	24
Purely non-materialistic terms	13	8	2	3	26
No interpretation given	4	3	5	3	15
Total	80	76	34	12	202

Farm operators interpreting "level of living" in terms of material items only (or primarily) tended to rate their own family's level of living at a medium or low status. Conversely farm operators defining "level of living" in non-materialistic terms only (or primarily) tended to rate their own family's level of living at a high status.

Table 8.- Contingency Table: Interpretation of Level of Living in Materialistic Terms and Self Rating at a High Level of Living, Farm Operators, Alberta, 1952

	: Subjectively determined : : level of living status : : High : Medium or low: Total		
	:	:	:
	:	:	:
	:	:	:
Materialistic terms only or primarily	48	84	132
Non-materialistic terms only or primarily	28	18	46
Total	76	102	178

It is of importance to note here that the direction of this association was opposite to that which might have been expected in view of the fact that previously a significant association had been found between a high materialistically-based objective level of living status, and a subjectively-determined high level of living status which was arrived at in terms of the farm operators' own interpretation of the term "level of living".

Generalization.- In view of these findings it may be generalized that: Farm operators who interpret level of living chiefly in non-materialistic terms tended to think of their own families as being at a relatively higher socio-economic status than farm operators who interpret level of living chiefly in materialistic terms.

Implication.- This generalization carries with it the implication that farm operators' satisfactions and feeling of well-being are not necessarily related to their material well-being. This might be one of the reasons why certain farm operators, as judged by impersonal criteria, may be termed disadvantaged and yet these same men by their own criteria may feel that they are not disadvantaged.

SUMMARY

As part of a study of the factors associated with choice of alternative farm enterprises, data were collected, in June and July of 1952, from a representative sample (202) of the 1,215 farm operators living in two census sub-divisions which lie within the mixed farming region of Central Alberta.

The Edwards socio-economic scale for objectively determining levels of living revealed that approximately 46 per cent of the farm operators had a high level of living, 45 per cent a medium level and only ten per cent a low level.

Because of a general lack of consensus on the meaning of the term "level of living", the farm operators were asked to state their interpretation of the meaning of this term. Definitions ranged from purely materialistic conceptions (food, clothing, shelter, price of farm products, amount of dollar income) to purely non-materialistic conceptions, (family and social contacts, peace of mind, willingness to work). Forty-five per cent of the farm operators answered in purely materialistic terms, 23 per cent in materialistic terms primarily and non-materialistic terms secondarily, 12 per cent in non-materialistic terms primarily and materialistic terms secondarily while 13 per cent answered in purely non-materialistic terms.

The respondents were asked, in terms of their own interpretation of the level of living concept, to rate the level of living of most Canadians, of most people in Alberta, of most people in their own community and of their own families. Approximately 40 per cent rated their own families at a high level of living, 38 per cent at a medium level and 17 per cent at a low level, six per cent would not rate their own families.

When ratings given for each population grouping were related to ratings given for each other population grouping it was found that feelings of equality in respect to level of living were most common when a farm operator compared his family with his community (73 per cent of respondents) and least common when a farm operator compared his family with Canada as a whole (43 per cent of respondents).

From 28 to 32 per cent of the respondents indicated that they felt that the level of living of their families, their communities and their province was higher than the level of living in Canada as a whole. Eleven per cent felt that their families were at an advantage to people in their province and only five per cent felt that their own family was at an advantage to the level of living in their own communities.

From 16 to 21 per cent of the respondents felt disadvantaged to their community, their province and their nation, a slightly smaller proportion (12 to 13) per cent felt that their communities were disadvantaged in relation to Alberta and to Canada, and only seven per cent felt that the level of living in Alberta was lower than that in Canada as a whole.

Interrelationships were investigated between objective and subjective levels of living ratings and respondents' interpretation of the "level of living" concept.

It was found that no statistically significant association existed between an objectively determined level of living status and a farm operator's interpretation of the "level of living" concept. This finding suggests the generalization that, for a farm operator, an objectively ascribed high level of living status is not significantly associated with his own interpretation of the meaning of the concept. This implies a need for an awareness of differing value systems among farm operators before assuming that they personally accept the socio-economic status ascribed to them chiefly on the basis of their material possessions.

A very significant association (99.9 per cent level) was found to exist between objectively and subjectively-determined level of living status. However the association tended to be influenced considerably by differing interpretations farmers put on "level of living" before rating their families. This influence was indicated by the fact that a relatively large number of respondents objectively rated as high nevertheless rated themselves as medium, and conversely a slightly larger proportion of those ranked objectively as medium nevertheless ranked themselves as high.

However this statistically significant association between relatively higher and lower level of living status would seem to validate the Edwards socio-economic scale as a device

for differentiating Alberta farm operators in terms of their level of living.

A very significant association (99.9 per cent level) was found to exist between a farm operator's interpretation of the level of living concept and his self-determined level of living status. It was found that farm operators interpreting "level of living" in materialistic terms only (or primarily) tended to rate their own family's level of living as being at a medium or low status, and, conversely, farm operators defining the concept in non-materialistic terms only (or primarily) tended to rate their own families at a high status.

This finding implies that farm operators' feelings of satisfaction with their family level of living are not necessarily related to their material well-being but may and are to some extent related to non-material satisfactions.

Conclusion.— It is hoped that this report dealing with level of living may be of use to all persons interested in and concerned with rural people. It is merely one of many research efforts necessary before a more complete understanding of rural people themselves is achieved.

APPENDIX

Items Used in Level of Living Scale

Item	: Level of : living score :
1. House construction:	
(1) Brick, stone, frame (stucco), frame (painted or brick veneer), or frame (stained shingle)	1
(2) All other types of construction, such as frame (unpainted or unstained shingle), or log	0
2. Rooms per person:	
(1) One or more rooms per person	1
(2) Less than one room per person	0
3. Storm windows:	
(1) For some or all windows	1
(2) None	0
4. Basement:	
(1) Full or part basement with concrete or stone walls and floor	1
(2) Full or part basement with earth walls and floor, or no basement	0
5. Heating system:	
(1) Furnace or space heater in basement	1
(2) Space heater in room, or kitchen stove only source of heat	0
6. Lighting:	
(1) Electricity, or gasoline or kerosene mantle lamps	1
(2) Wick lamps only	0
7. Cistern	1
8. Pumping system:	
(1) Running water, or power or hand-operated pump at well	1
(2) No pumping system	0

Item	: Level : living score :
9. Kitchen sink	1
10. Bathroom	1
11. Washing machine:	
(1) Power operated machine	1
(2) Hand operated washer, or no washing machine	0
12. Telephone	1
13. Clothes closets:	
(1) One or more	1
(2) None	0
14. Dining room (in addition to a kitchen)	1
15. Dining room table, buffet, or china cabinet	1
16. Chesterfield, davenport, or lounge	1
17. Easy chair	1
18. Bookcase or desk	1
19. Books:	
(1) Ten or more books, excluding school books	1
(2) Less than ten books	0
20. Piano	1
21. Floor construction:	
(1) Hardwood or softwood flooring throughout all or part of the house	1
(2) Rough flooring only	0
22. Kitchen floor finish:	
(1) Linoleum	1
(2) All other types of finish, or unfinished	0

Item	Level of living score
23. Living room floor finish:	
(1) Linoleum, paint, varnish, or wax	1
(2) All other types of finish, or unfinished	0
24. Living room wall finish:	
(1) Wallpaper, paint, or calcimine over plaster or plasterboard	1
(2) Other types of finish, or unfinished	0
25. Woodwork finish:	
(1) Painted or varnished throughout all or part of the house	1
(2) Unfinished	0
26. Daily or weekly newspapers:	
(1) Daily newspaper for six months or more, or three or more weekly newspapers	1
(2) Less than three weekly newspapers	0
27. Magazine subscriptions:	
(1) Two or more	1
(2) Less than two	0
Total possible score on 27 item scale	27

